

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 10 2004

PATENTS  
TRADEMARKS  
COPYRIGHTS

KERMIT F. ROSS  
1910-1986

OF COUNSEL  
PHILIP H. SHERIDAN  
DAVID F. ZINGER  
CRAIG C. GROSETH

TECHNICAL SPECIALISTS  
DENNIS J. DUPRAY, Ph.D.  
ANGELA DALLAS SEBOR, Ph.D.

**SHERIDAN ROSS**  
*A Professional Corporation*  
ATTORNEYS AND COUNSELORS AT LAW

1560 BROADWAY  
SUITE 1200  
DENVER, COLORADO 80202-5141

TELEPHONE (303) 863-9700  
FACSIMILE (303) 863-0223  
E-MAIL: srlaw@sheridanross.com

November 10, 2004

**FACSIMILE COVER SHEET**

Please deliver the following pages to:

Name: Official Filing  
Facsimile No. 703/872-9306  
Our File No. 4366-130  
Serial No. 10/713,639  
Total No. Pgs., incl. cover 3

Sender's Name: Bradley M. Knepper

Special Instructions: Accompanying this transmittal for filing with the USPTO is a Response to Restriction Requirement for Serial No. 10/713,639.

If you do not receive all pages, please call Kathleen at 303/863-9700.

THIS FACSIMILE MESSAGE IS CONFIDENTIAL AND MAY CONTAIN ATTORNEY PRIVILEGED INFORMATION INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL OR COMPANY NAMED ABOVE. If the reader is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone, so that we may arrange for the return of the original message to us. Thank you.

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**In Re the Application of:**

NORTE et al.

**Serial No.: 10/713,639**

**Filed: November 13, 2003**

Atty. File No.: 4366-130

For: "SHIELD FOR HIGH FREQUENCY  
TELECOMMUNICATIONS  
CONNECTOR"

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313

) Group Art Unit: 2833

) Examiner: Paumen, Gary F.

) Confirmation No. 2442

**RESPONSE TO  
RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to  
the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Fax No. 703/872-9306)  
on 11/10/04

*Kathleen McInnis* SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.  
KATHLEEN MCINNISH

**Dear Sir:**

This response to restriction requirement is submitted in reply to the Examiner's Action having a mailing date of October 13, 2004. While no fees are believed due in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge any fees deemed necessary to Deposit Account No. 19-1970.

In the Office Action dated October 13, 2004, the Examiner posed a requirement that either of two identified claim groups be selected for examination. The requirement is respectfully traversed. In particular, each of the identified groups of claims is not related to the other identified groups of claims as a process for using a product that can be practiced with another materially different product, or a product that can be used in a materially different process.

In particular, Applicants note that the claims identified as a part of Group I (Claims 1-35) recite either "a cable aperture" (Claims 1-32) or "means for allowing a multiple conductor cable to exit said shield means" (Claims 33-35). In comparison, the claims identified as belonging to Group II (Claims 36-50) recite "threading at least a first cable through a first aperture of a conductive shield" (Claims 36-43) or "placing at least a first cable in a first aperture of a conductive shield" (Claims 44-50). In view of these related elements, the finding of the Office Action that the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process is not accurate.

The apparatus claims specify that the recited aperture comprise "a cable aperture" (Claims 1-32) or "means for allowing a multiple conductor cable to exit such shield means" (Claims 33-35). Furthermore, the apparatus claims are generally directed to a connector shield. Because a connector shield is recited by the apparatus claims, a port through which a cable may be threaded (*i.e.*, a cable aperture) is required for the connector shield to function. The provision of a viewing port or a cooling port is not prohibited by the claims, however such a port would be in addition to the claimed cable aperture or means for allowing a multiple conductor cable to exit the shield means. That is, while a connector shield as claimed may be provided with additional features for additional purposes, the elements recited by the independent apparatus claims specify a cable aperture or means for allowing a multiple conductor cable to exit said shield means, not a viewing aperture or a cooling port. Furthermore, examination on the merits of all the pending claims would not present a serious burden.

Applicants provisionally elect to prosecute Claims 1-35 (Group I) should the restriction requirement be made final.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's restriction requirement are respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if doing so would expedite the resolution of this case.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERIDAN ROSS P.C.

By: 

Bradley M. Knepper  
Registration No. 44,189  
1560 Broadway, Suite 1200  
Denver, CO 80202-5141  
(303) 863-9700

Date: November 10, 2004